

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair is claiming this is news, although most documentaries are not news in the strict sense, and are not produced by a broadcast station or network. I would object as much to a broadcast of "Fahrenheit 9/11" on public airwaves rather than cable or pay-per-view so close to the election. This clearly is political speech, and should be treated as such allowing the same amount of time for Sen. Kerry.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.